EXHIBIT "B" Part 7 of 7

1	specifics on, you know, time frames.
2	An employee recalled
3	hauling hydrochloric acid from the
4	Bristol facility. DeRewal recalled
5	hauling acrylic latex and Sevin
6	insecticide and another DeRewal
7	employee recalled hauling drummed
8	wastes, types not specified.
9	There's just not enough
10	information there to be able to form
11	any meaningful I mean, do I
12	believe that waste was hauled from
13	Rohm & Haas Company during the period
14	of interest, yes.
15	Do I have any information
16	to be able to form an intelligent
17	opinion about what that waste was and
18	how much of it there was, I wasn't
19	comfortable.
20	Q. Can we turn to Simon
21	Wrecking?
22	A. Sure. Give me one second.
23	Q. Uh-huh.
24	A. Okay.

_	a and man baldama bhab a
1	Q. And you believe that a
2	minimum of 178,000 gallons of waste
3	consisting of paint sludge, solvents
4	waste acid and waste oil were
5	generated by Simon Wrecking during
6	the 1969 to 1977 period, correct?
7	A. That is correct.
8	Q. And what is that based on?
9	A. If we turn to Table 8 in
_0	the appendix of my report, we
L1	summarize from Jonas ledgers, there's
L2	entries of drums, which I believe are
L3	converted to gallons, and then, in
L4	some instances, reports of just
15	gallons of paint sludge solvent,
16	waste acid, and waste oil. This is
17	what we were able to pull from the
18	factual information.
19	We were able to look at
20	tank wagons and, because of some
21	cross-referencing, we were able to
22	get an understanding of what the
23	volume of a tank wagon typically
24	was. And we made an assumption that,

1	if the tank wagon went, the tank
2	wagon was filled.
3	The problem with this is
4	that we aren't really sure what the
5	exact dates are for this.
6	Q. Dates of what?
7	A. Of when these things were
8	picked up. I don't believe the Jonas
9	ledger, it gives us months and days,
10	but it doesn't give us years, so we
11	assume, if you look at the note on
12	the bottom, all data are assumed to
13	date from the same year because of
14	the position they were on the ledger,
15	but we have no idea what the year is.
16	Q. Okay. And why is it that
17	you were not able to extrapolate with
18	respect to Simon Wrecking?
19	A. If we we are fairly
20	confident that the 178,000-gallon
21	volume estimate is accurate, but we
22	have no idea if this is from June to
23	July of 1970, 1976, and what year.
24	It may be even conceivably, although

I don't think so, but outside the 1 period of interest. We just don't 2 3 know. So I was very uncomfortable 4 in principle, when I don't even know 5 what year this information 6 If I knew the year, then 7 represents. I probably would have done an 8 9 extrapolation. So if I were to say, Assume 10 that it all came from 1976, then you 11 would be able to do an extrapolation 12 with respect to Simon Wrecking? 13 As long as no one would 14 have an objection to that assumption, 15 If we know for certain that it 16 yes. came from 1976. And then we also 17 have insight, and I don't recall 18 anything in the record that suggests 19 that this operation significantly 20 changed over the eight-year period of 21 22 interest. 23 I would want to research that a little more. I think in this 24

1	instance, b	cause we	e didn't even know
2	what year t	nis came	from, I simply
3	decided we	ere goin	ng to report the
4	volume and	hat's it	: .
5	Q. D	you kno	ow the time period
6	that Simon	Irecking	operated?
7	A. I	believe	it operated
8	during the	eriod of	interest, 1969
9	to 1977. I	do not,	off the top of my
10	head, know	.f we wer	e given the
11	information	on their	entire
12	operational	history.	
13	Q. A	d what's	s the basis for
14	your belief	that the	ey did operate
14 15	your belief		
	during the	eriod of	
15	during the	eriod of	interest?
15 16	during the A. I seeing a do	eriod of don't re	f interest?
15 16 17	during the A. I seeing a do didn't oper	eriod of don't recument that	interest? ecall specifically hat said they
15 16 17 18	during the A. I seeing a do didn't oper interest, s	don't resument that during the ass	f interest? ecall specifically nat said they ng the period of
15 16 17 18 19	during the A. I seeing a do didn't oper interest, s they did op	eriod of don't resument thate during the asserte dur	interest? ecall specifically nat said they ng the period of sumption was that
15 16 17 18 19 20	during the A. I seeing a do didn't oper interest, s they did op	don't recument that during the asserte during the mean, to	interest? call specifically nat said they ng the period of sumption was that cing the period of chis issue they
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	during the A. I seeing a do didn't oper interest, s they did op interest. are a PRP a	don't reduced of don't reduced the during the asserted uring the asserted uring the this side this side this side this side this side the asserted t	interest? call specifically nat said they ng the period of sumption was that cing the period of chis issue they

1	So I know very little
2	about Simon Wrecking, I was given
3	very little information about Simon
4	Wrecking.
5	Q. So my question is knowing
6	what you do know that's set out on
7	Section 4.7.1.1 and Section 4.7.1.2,
8	if you knew the year of the Jonas
9	records
LO	A. Sorry, go ahead.
L1	Q. Knowing what you do know
L2	that's contained in Section 4.7.1.1
13	and 4.7.1.2 of your report, if you
14	did know the year of the Jonas
15	ledger, then you would extrapolate;
16	is that correct?
17	A. That is correct.
18	Q. And why is that? Why
19	specifically with respect to Simon
20	Wrecking? What information in those
21	two sections would allow you to
22	extrapolate?
23	A. I would look at two months'
24	worth of record and say that at a
	1

1	minimum this is the amount of
2	material that was produced for that
3	two-month period of time. It may
4	actually be more than that, because
5	June is very sparsely represented.
6	It's primarily one month of record.
7	So I'm just I'm very
8	uncomfortable given that I can't even
9	say with certainty what year this
LO	information represents to do an
L1	extrapolation. It is just a judgment
L2	call.
L3	If it was identified as
L3 L4	If it was identified as 1972, so I know it's within the
L 4	1972, so I know it's within the
L4 L5	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know,
L4 L5 L6	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know, I'm aware I have no reason to
L4 L5 L6	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know, I'm aware I have no reason to believe that their operations
L4 L5 L6 L7	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know, I'm aware I have no reason to believe that their operations substantially changed during that
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know, I'm aware I have no reason to believe that their operations substantially changed during that period of time, then, yes, I would be
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know, I'm aware I have no reason to believe that their operations substantially changed during that period of time, then, yes, I would be comfortable doing an extrapolation.
L4 L5 L6 L7 L8 L9	1972, so I know it's within the period of interest, and, you know, I'm aware I have no reason to believe that their operations substantially changed during that period of time, then, yes, I would be comfortable doing an extrapolation. Would it be as good an

is that not all extrapolations are necessarily of equal weight. What we are trying to do here is fill gaps and information where ideally should have that information and we don't. So what you are saying is Ο. you would extrapolate based on the information you know about Simon Wrecking if you knew the year of the Jonas ledger, correct? That would be a big factor Α. in my decision to go ahead and I would also want extrapolate, yes. to probably look at Simon a little more closely, although, again, we don't have a lot of records. My question is, then, if Q. that's the case, how is that different from Quickline, where, with

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1.1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	bit of information about both of
2	those it seems.
3	A. We did essentially the same
4	thing with both Quickline and Simon,
5	we simply reported what we knew.
6	Q. So is it the case that,
7	even if you did know the year of the
8	Jonas ledger, you would not
9	extrapolate with respect to Simon
10	Wrecking?
11	MS. FLAX: Objection.
12	THE WITNESS: If I knew the
13	year, then I would make an attempt at
14	extrapolation, and at the end of the
15	process would I because, you know,
16	as I indicated before, we go through
17	this process. I made a decision very
18	early on because I don't even know
19	the year, I'm simply going to report
20	the volume. That's it, and I'm not
21	going to go any further with in.
22	Q. But I'm asking you, if you
23	did know the year.
24	A. If I did know the year, I

would take that into consideration and likely extrapolate, but I would also want to look at the entire base of knowledge of Simon Wrecking again to form a final opinion. It is not just a bright line, flip the switch on or off.

Q. And you couldn't say, based on the information that's listed in your report here, based on the stuff that you have listed in your report here, instead of going out and looking at Simon Wrecking again, looking at the stuff that's right in front of you, would you extrapolate or not, if you knew the year of the Jonas record?

MS. FLAX: Objection.

THE WITNESS: I believe, and I have said before, at least a couple times, that I would probably extrapolate. This is -- 178,000 gallons for a thirty-day period of time is a fair amount of material.

2.4

1	BY MS. TROJECKI:
2	Q. So since you are saying
3	that you would extrapolate, what is
4	it about Simon Wrecking that would
5	what is it about the information in
6	4.7.1.1 and 4.7.1.2 that would cause
7	you to make that decision, what
8	specifically?
9	A. I'm trying my best to
10	answer the question that I think you
11	are trying to get at. I don't know
12	how to add anything more to our
13	discussion than probably what I have
14	already said.
15	Q. Let me just try to one more
16	time, too.
L7	The problem that I'm having
18	is that the information you have
L9	about Quickline that's contained in
20	the manufacturing and the waste
21	generation section seems to be
22	similar to the information you know
23	about Simon Wrecking.
24	A. Yes, except for there's

1	in Quickline we had 1,900 gallons and
2	here we have 178,000 gallons for a
3	very limited period of time. Other
4	than that, yes, it's, you know, it's
5	similar, I will accept that.
6	Q. So was that the difference,
7	then, the amount of wastes? So if
8	you say you have 178,000 gallons in
9	two months you can extrapolate, but
LO	if you only had 1,925 in one month
L1	then you can't?
L2	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
13	THE WITNESS: I wouldn't
14	say that. I wouldn't say that. I
15	wouldn't say that that's the
16	determining criteria.
17	As I said at the very
18	beginning, since I didn't know the
19	year that this represents, at the
20	very beginning, at the very onset I
21	said I am uncomfortable with
22	extrapolating this. The data should
23	be able to tell me what year this
24	represents, and if it can't then I
	•

1	simply would do what I did with
2	Quickline and report the volume.
3	And it's almost certainly a
4	minimum quantity, but I cannot say
5	more than that.
6	BY MS. TROJECKI:
7	Q. I understand that. And I
8	understand that you said that if you
9	did know the year you would
10	extrapolate.
11	A. I would likely extrapolate,
12	yes.
13	Q. And you did say that the
14	information that you know about
15	Quickline is similar to the
16	information you know about Simon
17	Wrecking?
18	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
19	THE WITNESS: It's limited
20	in both instances.
21	BY MS. TROJECKI:
22	Q. But with respect to
23	Quickline you did not extrapolate,
24	but you would extrapolate with

1	respect to Simon Wrecking?
2	MS. FLAX: Objection.
3	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
4	BY MS. TROJECKI:
5	Q. Is that correct?
6	A. I would be inclined to
7	extrapolate Simon Wrecking, yes.
8	Q. And can you tell me why you
9	would do it with respect to Simon
10	Wrecking and not Quickline?
11	MS. WRIGHT: Objection.
12	THE WITNESS: All right,
13	let's go into Quickline.
14	In the case of Quickline,
15	we have a DeRewal invoice for 35
16	drums of waste chromic acid in 1973.
17	We're assuming those drums are 55
18	gallons and that they are full. It's
19	a relatively small quantity in a
20	one-time event.
21	Here for Simon Wrecking we
22	have what would be construed as a
23	one-time event, but there are
24	interestingly many tank wagons, many

1 drums over a 20, 25-day period, which 2 reflects a substantially larger 3 volume of waste material. In Quickline this may just 4 5 have been an incidental generation of 6 waste. When you look at Simon 7 Wrecking, there's at least a small 8 glimmer that there's quite a bit of 9 waste being generated here. BY MS. TROJECKI: 10 11 Q. Okay. 12 And you are asking me about Α. 13 a hypothetical, what I would do if 14 had the year, and I said yes, I would 15 probably extrapolate, but I would 16 also go back and take a look at all 17 else that I know about Simon 18 Wrecking, because, again, the 19 decision to not extrapolate was one 20 that I reached very early in this 21 process, because I didn't really -- I 22 couldn't even say what year it is, 23 and I'm just uncomfortable with the 24 ledger and the quality of the

1	information to allow me to do that,
2	and, hopefully, that addresses your
3	concern.
4	Q. Okay, let's move on to
5	Sperry/Burroughs. You believe
6	that and I'm going to refer to
7	Sperry/Burroughs and Unisys all as
8	the same company, as Sperry.
9	A. Okay.
10	Q. You believe that Sperry
11	generated a minimum of 3,615 gallons
12	of waste from 1969 to 1977, correct?
13	A. Let me change that or
14	clarify that.
15	If you look at Table 9 in
16	my appendix for Sperry/Burroughs, the
17	period of time where we have factual
18	information is 1972 to 1974. So in
19	the case of Sperry/Burroughs, what we
20	are able to tally up using, in one
21	instance, a purchase order issue to
22	DeRewal, a Univac purchase order, and
23	a DeRewal chemical invoice, the total
24	is 3,615 gallons. And this is for

1 two different facilities, Blue Bell, 2 Pennsylvania, and Utica, New York. 3 So, basically, we concluded 4 on Page 4-12 of my expert report those data are listed in Table 9 and 5 summarized in Table Roman Numeral IX 6 7 as totaling 3,615 gallons. They considered too limited to permit an 8 estimate or extrapolation of monthly 9 10 annual waste volumes. So this fits into the 11 Quickline kind of model. I simply 12 13 don't have enough information to be 14 Also, the biggest able to say. 15 quantity or element of this waste is 16 something just called industrial 17 waste. And what does that -- how 18 Q . 19 does that 20 It doesn't tell me anything Α. about the process that generated it. 21 22 0. Let's move on to the Navy. 23 am going to go with your counsel's 24 previous stipulation that the

FAX 215.751.0581

1	information is limited to the
2	documents you reviewed and deposition
3	testimony.
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. And you were not able to
6	render any opinion about the estimate
7	of total waste quantified by the
8	Navy; is that correct?
9	A. That is correct.
10	Q. And why is that?
11	A. In Section 4.9.2 of my
12	expert report, there's two pieces of
13	information from deposition testimony
14	that we consider to be very sketchy.
15	One is J. Barsum recalling
16	two waste pickups at Johnsville Air
17	Base, less than 20 drums each time.
18	And then Manford DeRewal recalls
19	picking up drums from the naval
20	facility off Street Road on two or
21	three occasions. They were in either
22	in 5- to 55-gallon containers,
23	possibly 10 to 20 drums.
24	It's just very hearsay-type

www.JDReporting.com

1	recollection. It's not anything that
2	I can put my hands on. Wouldn't even
3	begin to try to understand what the
4	nature of the wastes generation at
5	the Navy's facilities were. And I
6	assuming that it is just Warminster.
7	I'm assuming that the Johnsville and
8	the Navy facility off Street Road are
9	the same. I believe they are.
10	Q. Okay. Now, for many of the
11	plaintiffs and settled defendants,
12	with respect to quantifying their
13	waste types, you have indicated that
14	a lot of times it was a personal
15	judgment call and I believe you used
16	those words exactly several times
17	today?
18	A. That's correct.
19	Q. So what expertise did you
20	apply in making the personal judgment
21	call that you did in creating this
22	report?
23	A. Well, I thought we had
24	discussed that in the past in terms

of the expertise that I brought to
this assignment.
Q. Okay, so you named in the
past two areas that you considered
yourself to be an expert, hydrology
and site remediation?
A. That's correct.
Q. Did the hydrology side
factor into the preparation your
hydrology expertise factor into the
preparation of this report?
A. Not directly, no.
Q. So it's the site
remediation expertise?
A. That's correct.
Q. And what expertise on the
site remediation side did you utilize
in making the personal judgment calls
that you made?
_
A. That's an over that's a
A. That's an over that's a very, very broad question.
very, very broad question.

www.JDReporting.com

1 in industrial facilities, taking 2 environmental contamination and 3 tracing it back to its source and 4 trying to mitigate the sources of 5 contamination at industrial 6 facilities. 7 That experience directly 8 relates to -- coupled with the 9 environmental remediation side of 10 managing and handling wastes and 11 sending wastes to facilities and 12 knowing how it is packaged and 13 knowing the RCRA regulations, knowing 14 the Superfund regulations, all of 15 that comes together in being able to 16 evaluate what a waste is, how to 17 quantify it, and how to evaluate how it was handled by each of these 18 19 companies. 20 So in the case of 21 Quickline, for instance, what 22 expertise particularly did you apply 23 to say, No, I don't have enough 24 information to extrapolate here? I

1	mean, couldn't I do the same thing,
2	read a document and say it looks like
3	there are entries for March, January,
4	February, it doesn't look complete,
5	why not just extrapolate?
6	A. It's entirely possible that
7	you could. I'm not going to say that
8	you couldn't.
9	MS. TROJECKI: Just take a
10	quick break. I want to read the
11	revised report.
12	(Recess taken)
13	BY MS. TROJECKI:
14	Q. During our 10, 15 minute
15	break, I quickly reviewed your
16	revised report and I guess,
17	generally, the question I had with
18	respect to the revised report is, did
19	any of the information that you added
20	in the revised report change any of
21	your ultimate opinions with respect
22	to each plaintiff or settled
23	defendant?
24	A. It, in my opinion, made

minor changes to a couple of the plaintiffs or settled defendants final tallies;, it didn't make a substantive change in terms of the magnitude of wastes that we think might have been generated.

- Q. Was there ever an instance where you extrapolated in one instance and got some of these documents and decided that you shouldn't extrapolate or, vice versa, that you didn't extrapolate, reviewed the documents and then made a decision to extrapolate?
- A. I don't think it would have changed decisions on extrapolation.

 There is, though, I think in

 Cyanamid, there is an MIT article that we received, and in there they did research basically looking at a manufacturing process to try to remove aniline or some -- I forget exactly what the constituent was, but they produced a number for ammonia

1	waste that differs from what we had
2	in the tables.
3	And what we are proposing
4	in this report is not necessarily to
5	change the conclusions but simply to
6	include this other source of
7	information in our compilation of
8	multiple sources of waste generated
9	at the Cyanamid Bound Brook facility.
10	Q. Let's actually mark your
11	revised copy of your expert report.
12	A. Do you have another copy of
13	that?
14	Q. No.
15	A. I brought one with me. Is
16	it okay for me to make reference to
17	that?
18	Q. Yes. Uh-huh.
19	(Hochreiter Exhibit 12 was
20	marked for identification.)
21	BY MS. TROJECKI:
22	Q. So we marked as Hochreiter
23	12 the revised copy of your expert
24	report, which is we have actually

1	marked a letter dated February 26,
2	2007, from Lynn Wright to me that
3	includes the sections of the reports
4	that were revised.
5	A. Okay.
6	Q. So your conclusion with
7	respect to American Cyanamid in the
8	unrevised report was that the
9	extrapolated quantity of waste
10	generated by American Cyanamid based
11	on the American Cyanamid records
12	well, let me just refer you to Table
13	I, Roman Numeral I, of your unrevised
14	report.
15	A. Okay.
16	Q. And the question is does
17	the information in this MIT research
18	report change the numbers that are
19	listed in Table 1a?
20	A. My recollection is that we
21	did not change those numbers. What
22	we did was we simply added the new
23	information to Table 1a, which is the
24	parent of Table I, if you will.

Γ	
1	Q. So you did issue a revised
2	Table I?
3	A. Yes, we're on Table la.
4	Q. I don't have that. Oh, not
5	Roman Numeral I, just revised 1.
6	A. Not Roman numeral, yes.
7	You see that at the bottom, it's
8	shaded. Yes. Yes.
9	Q. Does that actually say
10	something?
11	A. It does on my version.
12	Q. What does it say?
13	A. Why don't you read it.
14	Q. Okay, so aqueous ammonia
15	annual volume 2.9 million pounds?
16	A. Right. Yes.
17	Q. And you originally had,
18	based on the American Cyanamid
19	records, 721,780 pounds of ammonia,
20	correct, for this '76 to '78 time
21	period?
22	A. Where do you see that?
23	Q. The first page of Table 1a.
24	MS. FLAX: I believe she's

looking in your original report that
was marked Hochreiter 1.
THE WITNESS: In this
table?
BY MS. TROJECKI:
Q. The first table was la,
which I do not believe was changed.
A. I don't think it was
changed either. I just probably
okay, and, again, what number do you
want me to verify?
Q. The 721,780.
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. So that's one estimate of
ammonia generation generated by
American Cyanamid during a certain
time period, correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And another estimate is on
Table 1a, the second page, for the
year 1976 for ammonia you have in
gallons 615,000 gallons?
A. That is correct.
Q. And for 1977 200,000

1	gallons?	
2	A. That's correct.	
3	Q. So do you have any opinion	
4	as to whether the MIT study or the	
5	Jonas records or the American	
6	Cyanamid records, which of those is	
7	the most accurate estimate of ammonia	
8	generation?	
9	A. Again, it's hard for me to	
10	indicate which particular record is	
11	better or worse than another;	
12	however, in this one instance, I will	
13	say that in reading the MIT report	
14	the purpose of the MIT report was not	
15	to opine as to how much ammonia,	
16	aqueous ammonia is created.	
17	Its intention was to do	
18	some research and figure out how to	
19	remove aniline contamination from the	
20	process. And as a result, they	
21	reference 2.9 million pounds of	
22	aqueous ammonia. That is a different	
23	category of information in my mind	
24	from the actual Cyanamid reporting	
	1	

1	records where they are presumably
2	actually counting the pounds in the
3	field at the facility.
4	What we say in the
5	conclusion on Page 3-6 of the revised
6	report, the last new sentence, "The
7	extrapolated totals at least with
8	respect to ammonia waste liquid may
9	represent minimum quantities if as
10	noted by the 1975 MIT research report
11	2.9 million pounds of aqueous ammonia
12	were in fact generated annually."
13	Q. Are there any other
14	instances in the revised report where
15	there was a change in the conclusion
16	with respect to a particular
17	plaintiff or settled defendant?
18	A. Give me a minute. Let me
19	just look at the language. I think
20	that was the one that stuck out as
21	probably the most significant, but I
22	want to be careful.
23	For Philco Ford it appears
24	that some additional waste generation

1	information was provided in the new
2	documentation.
3	Q. I think I might be was
4	there a change is there a Page
5	3-17 on your revised report?
6	A. I'm sure there is. What we
7	gave you were just those pages that
8	were revised.
9	Q. Because I assume that, if
10	there's new documentation of waste,
11	that would be reflected in the last
12	paragraph, but I don't have that.
13	A. For which company?
14	Q. Ford.
15	A. May I see that?
16	MS. FLAX: Off the record
17	for a second.
18	(Discussion off the
19	record.)
20	THE WITNESS: The
21	conclusions for Ford did not change.
22	BY MS. TROJECKI:
23	Q. Okay.
24	A. What I want to do is I want
	1

1	to pull the table.
2	Q. 3?
3	A. Yes, so that's fine. What
4	you have is correct.
5	Q. So Table 3 didn't change at
6	all?
7	A. No. No, it did not.
8	Q. So what is the new
9	information, then, that you learned
10	about Ford?
11	A. Ford indicated that 184
L2	55-gallon drums or 10,120 gallons of
L3	waste finishing material was removed
L 4	by DeRewal Chemical Company from the
L5	Watsontown plant and that
16	approximately 32 55-gallon drums of
L7	industrial waste solution were
18	removed by DeRewal Chemical Company
_9	from Plant 50.
20	Q. Is that information
21	requested in Table 3?
22	A. The problem that we have is
23	we don't really know whether that
2.4	material is included in Table 3,

1	whether it is already indicated by
2	the entries or whether it's truly new
3	information. So to be conservative
4	we decided not to modify the table.
5	Q. Okay. Are there any other
6	sections or any other instances in
7	your report where the conclusions may
8	have changed with respect to a
9	particular plaintiff or settled
10	defendant?
11	A. What I will do is I'm just
12	going to skim the tables, because if
13	there was a substantive revision it
14	would be reflected in the table.
15	Keep in mind that there are a couple
16	of references in here to additional
17	information that we're still looking
18	for.
19	Q. Okay.
20	A. So it's possible that if
21	that additional information manifests
22	itself we may still want to revisit
23	this yet again.
24	If we go to Ciba-Geigy,

FAX 215.751.0581

1	Table 6a is probably a good place to
2	focus. If you look at the new 6a,
3	and I'm hoping you can read it in
4	black and white. I'm going to show
5	you this version with Lynn's
6	permission, okay. You will see that
7	there were a few additional entries
8	for, I think it's spent acid.
9	Q. And are the additional
10	entries in color?
11	A. They are, yes.
12	Q. So these were new documents
13	that you found with respect to Ciba-
14	Geigy that actually resulted in you
15	increasing the total number of
16	gallons?
17	A. Actually, we ended up
18	decreasing the total number of
19	gallons slightly. The extrapolated
20	waste volume. Because what that
21	additional information did was it
22	depressed slightly the annual
23	averages that we were using, so it
24	brought the number down slightly.

The new number of
extrapolated eight-year waste acid
volume for Ciba-Geigy is 705,199. If
I remember off the top of my head,
the old number was 720 maybe. Let's
pull Table 6b from the original
report.
Q. 728,239?
A. Yes. That sounds right.
Q. Okay. I want to I'm
going to show you some documents that
were produced by defense counsel
A. If you give me one I
just want to make certain I have
answered your question thoroughly,
and I believe I have now, yes.
Q. I want to show you some
documents that were included in the
documents that defense counsel sent
to me that were presumably in your
file.
The first document is
titled "Boarhead Farms Deposition
Summary: Pertinent facts stated

1	about each litigation," and then it
2	just cuts off with "par." I assume
3	that's party. "Draft work in
4	progress." And on the top it says
5	deponent name Marvin Jonas, depo
6	date, no exhibits provided for SEC
7	review, dated April 14, 1986.
8	Do you know who prepared
9	this document?
LO	A. This was prepared by
11	Valerie and I. And, actually, it
L2	printed very strangely. This is an
L3	Excel table that wasn't formatted
L4	properly for printing, so that's why
L5	you can't read it. I'm not sure I
L6	would want to try to read it in this
L7	format.
L8	Q. Do you still have it saved
L9	on your computer?
20	A. I produced it to Lynn and
21	I'm sure Lynn has it electronically,
22	as I'm sure I probably do as well.
23	So it could be
24	Q. Reformatted and printed so

1	it is readable?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Okay.
4	A. But what this was was a
5	working document that we used as we
6	were reviewing depositions to try to
7	cull out the pertinent information
8	from each of them. And we did that
9	relative to the individual
10	plaintiffs.
11	Q. Did Valerie create this or
12	did you?
13	A. Valerie formatted it; I
14	provided input, as did she, as we
15	were reviewing material.
16	Q. Okay. Okay, the next
17	document I want to show you is an
18	e-mail from Valerie Holliday to you
19	dated September 10th, 2006, with an
20	attachment that says Table 1, Chrono
21	Events, BHF.doc, and then there is an
22	attachment that has a Table 1,
23	Chronologic History of Events
24	regarding DeRewal Chemical Company

www.JDReporting.com

1	and Boarhead Farms Superfund site.
2	A. Do you want to mark this?
3	Q. No.
4	Who created this document?
5	A. This was created by
6	Valerie. I asked her to pull
7	together a table that essentially
8	gave us in one concise easy to manage
9	format what the DeRewal operating
10	history was.
11	Q. The next thing I'm going to
12	give you is a document that's titled
13	Notes of an Interview, Larry Piotti,
14	and it's notes of an interview with
15	Larry Piotti on December 3rd, 2005,
16	at his house in Pottstown.
17	And at the end of that
18	document are two notes of telephone
19	conversations, one dated January 7,
20	2005, regarding a telephone
21	conversation with Earl Wagner and
22	another dated January 11, 2005,
23	regarding a telephone conversation
24	with Francis Kline.
ı	Language and the second

1	Do you know who created
2	this document?
3	A. I don't know who created
4	this document.
5	Q. It is something that was
6	given to you by defense counsel; is
7	that right?
8	A. That's the only way we
9	would have received it, yes.
LO	Q. And do you know who the I
L1	on Page 5 of that document, who the
L2	person is that spoke to Earl Wagner,
L3	who the I refers to?
L4	A. I do not.
15	Q. The next document is a
16	document that's dated September 8th,
17	2006, entitled Carpenter Technology
18	Corp Boarhead Farms Ford Production
19	Index. Do you know who created this
20	document?
21	A. I do not know who created
22	this document. I know that I did
23	not.
24	Q. Did you use it at all in

1	did you consider it in your expert
2	report?
3	A. I believe so. I believe we
4	did, yes.
5	Q. How so?
6	A. I can't recall. I really
7	don't know. I mean, I remember
8	seeing that document, but I don't
9	know who created it.
10	Q. Okay. Are these documents
11	that we are going through listed in
12	your report as documents you
13	considered? Do you know if you
14	listed them?
15	A. We tried to list every
16	single document that we used in the
17	report, so I'm going to assume that
18	it's listed, but I can't say with
19	certainty. I do remember seeing that
20	document, but
21	Q. Then the last one I'm going
22	to show you is an e-mail from you to
23	Valerie Holliday dated September 11,
24	2006, and it references an
i	

1	attachment, BF Drums one dot XLS, and
2	there's an attachment that's entitled
3	Boarhead Farms Privileged and
4	Confidential Draft Prepared at the
5	Request of Counsel, Drum Allocations
6	Based on Tetra Tech June 25th, 2004
7	Remedial Action Oversight Report.
8	Did you prepare this
9	document?
10	A. I did prepare this
11	document.
12	Q. Was the substance of this
13	document ultimately contained in your
14	expert report in this matter?
15	A. It was not.
16	Q. And you have no opinions
17	with respect to any of the contents
18	of the attachment regarding drum
19	allocations; is that correct?
20	A. That is correct.
21	MS. TROJECKI: Okay, I'm
22	done. Thank you. I have no other
23	questions.
24	THE WITNESS: Okay.

```
1
                     (Thereupon, at 6:04 p.m.
 2
      the deposition concluded.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

387

1	WITNESS CERTIFICATION
2	
3	
4	
5	I hereby certify that I
6	have read the foregoing transcript of
7	my deposition testimony, and that my
8	answers to the questions propounded,
9	with the attached corrections or
11	changes, if any, are true and
12	correct.
13	
14	
15	DATE JOSEPH J. HOCHREITER, JR.,
16	CGWP
17	
18	
19	
20	PRINTED NAME
21	
22	
23	
24	

CERTIFICATION

I, JENNIFER L. BERMUDEZ, a

Court Reporter in and for the Commonwealth

of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the

foregoing is a true and accurate transcript

of the deposition of said witness who was

first duly sworn by me on the date and

place hereinbefore set forth.

neither attorney nor counsel for, nor related to or employed by, any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed in this action, nor am I financially interested in this case.

JENNIFER L. BERMUDEZ

Court Reporter and Notary Public